

As regards the difficulties consequent on the present rule relating to affidavits, the point has been already answered by me with reference to a prior representation.

The other points mentioned by you will be considered.

34. Establishment of a Munsiff's Court at Nedumangad.

Mr. M. Subrahmanya Pillai (Member, Nedumangad taluk) stated that, as compared with other taluks in the State, Nedumangad was subordinate only to a few, in point of area, population and revenue. But the taluk suffered much in the matter of administration of civil justice. The necessity of establishing a Munsiff's court in the taluk had formed the subject of repeated representations ever since the institution of the Assembly.

The three Munsiffs' Courts exercising jurisdiction in the taluk, *viz.*, Neyyattinkara, Trivandrum and Attingal, were outside the Nedumangad taluk and the hardships suffered by the litigant public in seeking help from them in consequence were obviously great. The Member stated that the town of Nedumangad was a most convenient place for the establishment of a Munsiff's court. There was no necessity of a third Munsiff's court at Neyyattinkara because the people there neither desired, nor asked for it.

The Member concluded his representation by urging the Government to establish a Munsiff's Court in Nedumangad.

President's reply.—Government addressed the High Court on this subject. The High Court scrutinised the civil statistics and also wrote to the Tahsildars of Neyyattinkara, Chirayinkil and Nedumangad with a view to ascertain whether there was enough work for a separate Munsiff at Nedumangad, or at least for a Munsiff-Magistrate. The High Court have reported that the civil work contributed by the *pakuthies* which could properly be brought within the territorial jurisdiction of the proposed court and the criminal work in the whole of the Nedumangad taluk would not keep a Munsiff-Magistrate's court fully engaged at Nedumangad and that opinion has been accepted by the Government. If, in future, the work is found to increase, Government will reconsider the question.

Member.—The *pakuthies* of Aryanad and Vempayam at least may be transferred from the jurisdiction of the Neyyattinkara court to the court at Trivandrum.

President's reply.—Government will consider that suggestion.

35. Extension of the territorial jurisdiction of the Changanachery Munsiff's Court so as to include at least Putuppalli and the northern portion of the Kalluppara Pakuthi.

Mr. Paramesvara Kurup Eravi Kurup (Member, Changanachery taluk) urged the need for increasing the territorial jurisdiction of the local Munsiff's Court lest the decrease in the number of cases should eventually lead to its abolition. He pointed out that the transfer of jurisdiction over the *pakuthies* of Vazhur, Vellavur, Putuppalli and Kanjirapalli to the Kottayam and Kanjirapalli Munsiff's courts agreeably to the wishes of the people caused the fall in the number of cases in the Changanachery Munsiff's court and that the level might be restored by the inclusion of the *pakuthies* of Putuppalli and Kalluppara within its jurisdiction. As, however, the Municipal members of Kottayam and Tiruvalla expressed their disagreement to the proposed transfer, he did not press it. If, in the opinion of the Government, there was not sufficient work for the court to justify its existence, the local Munsiff might be invested with magisterial powers so as to give increased work to the court.

President's reply.—The question has been considered many a time. The opinion of the High Court is that, if the territorial jurisdiction of the Changanachery Munsiff's court should be extended, it was necessary that either of the *pakuthies* of Putuppalli or Kalluppara should be split up and Government consider that no change could be made until the *pakuthies* were split up at the next settlement. The matter will, however, be re-examined. The question whether Changanachery should have a Stationary Magistrate or a First Class Magistrate is under the consideration of the Government.